

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 29, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 22 is currently amended and claims 9-12 and 14 are currently cancelled. Claims 28-30 are added. Thus, claims 22-25 and 27-30 are currently pending, with claims 1-8 and 15-21 withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 9-12, 14, 22-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,646,689 to Matsuda (hereinafter “Matsuda”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 22 is allowable in that it recites “maintaining one of the first and second substrates between the neighboring units of the first unit, the second unit, the third unit, a fourth unit, and a fifth unit using buffer lines disposed between each neighboring units while the other of the first and second substrates is processed in the corresponding units in order to synchronize the first and second substrates.” Matsuda does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states “a plurality of buffer lines (Matsuda’s improvement, i.e., restraining step) by using the carrying robot (9) between the lines during processing to synchronize the first and second substrates.” See Office Action, page 3, lines 6-8. However, in Matsuda, the robot is disposed in outer region of a LC dropping unit (4), a resin applying unit (5), a processing unit (6), and an UV irradiating unit (7). Further, the robot (9) is

moving the region where the LC dropping unit (4), the resin applying unit (5), the processing unit (6), and the UV irradiating unit (7) are disposed to maintain the substrates in a plurality of units. Contrary to Matsuda, in the claimed invention, the buffer line is disposed between two neighboring lines to maintain only the substrates between the neighboring lines. That is, the buffer line of the claimed invention is not moving in the region where units are disposed. Thus, Matsuda does not teach “maintaining one of the first and second substrates between the neighboring units of the first unit, the second unit, the third unit, a fourth unit, and a fifth unit using buffer lines disposed between each neighboring units while the other of the first and second substrates is processed in the corresponding units in order to synchronize the first and second substrates.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22, and its dependent claims 22-25 and 27, are allowable over Matsuda.

Since Applicants have cancelled claims 9-12 and 14, the rejection of claims 9-12 and 14 are now believed to be moot.

Applicants believe the foregoing remarks and amendments place the application in condition for f for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

**Application No.: 10/607,007**  
**Amdt. dated September 28, 2007**  
**Reply to Office Action dated June 29, 2007**

**Docket No. 8734.217 US**

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: September 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Eric J. Nuss  
Registration No.: 40,106  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant